

**REMARKS**

Currently, claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-9 are pending in the application. The withdrawal of the double-patenting rejection with respect to the pending claims by way of the outstanding Office Action is noted with appreciation. Currently, all the pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over DeBrouse (U.S. Patent 5,920,053) in view of Yap et al. (U.S. Patent 6,108,636).

Support for the amendments to claim 1 is found in the claim as filed. Support for the amendments to claim 3 is found in the specification at page 5, lines 16-20. Likewise, support for the amendments to claim 7 is also found within this portion of the specification. As such, it is submitted that no new matter has been added to the application by way of these amendments.

Consistent with the response to arguments provided in the paragraph spanning pages 4-5 of the outstanding Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to include the feature previously found lacking in the claim, namely "associated with passenger identity verification while boarding a plane." (Outstanding Office Action, page 4, section 5, last line). Likewise, claims 3 and 7 have been amended to state with greater clarity that the ink color used to print a boarding pass associated with a particular transport departure is immediately identifiable when a second transport departure is printed in a different ink color so as to rapidly identify an individual attempting to board an incorrect departure through a rapid visual examination of a boarding pass produced according to the present invention.

With regard to the machine data reader citing to page 8, first paragraph of the June 1, 2006 amendment (outstanding Office Action, page 5, lines 1-2), Applicant submits that a machine data reader is found in claim 8 at line 8. As such, reconsideration as to remarks of record with respect to claim 8 is hereby requested.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite with greater clarity that the data series is read from said boarding pass to said computer database. While the antecedent basis to the data series made this implicit, the current amendment is intended to make clear that the data series is read from the boarding pass to the computer database.

The current basis for the rejection of claim 1 is that DeBrouse teaches recitation of claim 1 with the exception of retrieval embodied in the last three lines of pending claim 1. Yap et al. is cited to bolster the teachings of DeBrouse with reference to the teachings found at column 9, lines 50-62 and column 10, lines 5-14.

It is respectfully submitted that the teachings of Yap et al. are insufficient to bolster the limitations of DeBrouse. The recited teachings of Yap et al. state at column 9, lines 58-62:

At the security checkpoint, the passenger is requested to interact with the biometrics data input device while also inserting the boarding pass into the improved security identification document interface device. The document interface device checks for a match between the input biometrics data and the biometrics data stored on the boarding pass.

While Yap et al. teaches a comparison of stored biometric data to the biometric data coded in the boarding pass, Yap is silent as to retrieving a passenger image as a “human-cognizable image on a video display in response to entry of an individualized travel datum of the passenger into a computer in communication with said centralized database ....” As such, it is respectfully submitted that Yap et al. fails to teach a picture of a passenger being retrieved on a video display and as such pending claim 1 includes recitations nowhere found in the prior art that as a result are entitled to patentable weight. Yap et al. in providing a comparison between biometric data in checking stored data versus that presented by the boarding pass has a computer perform a comparative check, whereas the invention of claim 1 in providing a human-cognizable image on a video display requires a human being to make the comparison. As Yap et al.

provides no motivation to use human verification as opposed to machine verification, Applicant submits that the claim recitation found in the last three lines of claim 1 is entitled to patentable weight as it is nowhere found in the prior art.

With respect to claim 3, while Applicant readily concedes that DeBrouse prints an image in a given color, there is neither a teaching nor suggestion in DeBrouse for color coding a particular departure with images printed in a given ink color. As such, Applicant hereby incorporates by reference the remarks made of record in the amendment of June 1, 2006 found on page 7, paragraphs 2-5 of that reply to Office Action.

Reconsideration of claim 8 is requested based on the presence of the "machine data reader" as a feature providing patentable weight over DeBrouse.

Likewise, reconsideration of claim 9 is requested over DeBrouse on the basis of the above amendments and the remarks made of record in the June 1, 2006 amendment in reply to Office Action.

### Summary

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-9 remain pending in the application. Entry of this amendment is requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of all the claims over DeBrouse in view of Yap et al. is also requested.

Dated: December 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: Avery N. Goldstein, Ph.D.  
Avery N. Goldstein, Ph.D.,  
Registration No.: 39,204  
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE,  
ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.  
2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330  
Post Office Box 7021  
Troy, Michigan 48007-7021  
(248) 647-6000  
Attorney for Applicant